
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: 8:23-cv-00333-FWS-JDE

Date: March 7, 2023

Title: Anthony P. Veltri v. Rockler Companies, Inc. *et al.*

Present: **HONORABLE FRED W. SLAUGHTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Melissa H. Kunig
Deputy Clerk

N/A
Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Not Present

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

Not Present

**PROCEEDINGS: (IN CHAMBERS): ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE DISMISSAL FOR
LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION**

This action was filed in this court on February 24, 2023. However, it appears the court may lack subject matter jurisdiction. Jurisdiction is asserted on the basis of diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Artificial entities have been joined as Defendants in this action. However, the citizenships of these entities appear to be inadequately pleaded. (See Dkts. 1, 4.)

In the case of a partnership, limited liability company, or other unincorporated association, the court must consider the citizenship of each of the partners, including limited partners, or members. The citizenship of each of the entity's partners or members must therefore be alleged. *Carden v. Arkoma Assocs.*, 494 U.S. 185, 195-96 (1990); *Johnson v. Columbia Props. Anchorage, LP*, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006). Where a party is joined as a corporation, the complaint must allege both its respective state(s) of incorporation and principal place of business. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c); *Harris v. Rand*, 682 F.3d 846, 850 (9th Cir. 2012).

Accordingly, the court **ORDERS** plaintiff(s) to show cause in writing no later than **March 20, 2023**, why this action should not be dismissed without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Failure to respond by the above date will result in the Court dismissing this action. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); *Link v. Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962) (“The

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: 8:23-cv-00333-FWS-JDE

Date: March 7, 2023

Title: Anthony P. Veltri v. Rockler Companies, Inc. *et al.*

authority of a court to dismiss sua sponte for lack of prosecution has generally been considered an ‘inherent power,’ governed . . . by the control necessarily vested in courts to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.”); *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 640-43 (9th Cir. 2002) (affirming sua sponte dismissal with prejudice “for failure to prosecute and for failure to comply with a court order”).

Initials of Deputy Clerk: mku